



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,673	06/18/2001	Tae-Young Kim	IK-0020	7194

34610 7590 12/03/2003

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

3

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,673

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bridson(6,359,270).

Bridson disclose an apparatus module(12) for inputting and displaying data for a household appliance such as a microwave or a freezer(column 3, lines 24-48). The module(12) is attached to the outer surface of the appliance and it comprises a touchscreen(column 10 ,lines 49-65), a memory means(25,28) and a control means(29,36) which all function as claimed.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridson in view of Omori(5,675,363).

In claim 2, relative to the limitation "storing information on foods", it is noted that the touch panel module(12) of Bridson is connected to internet and functions

Art Unit: 2674

as a family organizer, note pad or notice board capable of storing image data written or drawn on the touch panel(column 18, lines 46-55). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bridson such that to store information on foods stored in a refrigerator in the form of images because as pointed out above the touch pad module(12) attached to the front surface door of an appliance functions as a family organizer, note pad or a notice board.

5. Claim 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridson in view of Omori.

Bridson is discussed above. Omori is cited to show that the concept of utilizing a memory storage means(40) divided into a plurality of blocks wherein each block correspond to an image block displayed on a display unit(30) is old(column 6, lines 9-67 and figure 5).

As to claims 3-6, relative to the limitations "division of storage into areas respectively corresponding to a plurality of food storage chambers in the refrigerator or deletion of a selected image data", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bridson with the above noted teaching of Omori such that to divide the storage means(25,28) into areas and in each area storing image data on the stored food respectively corresponding to a plurality of food chambers provided in the refrigerator because Omori shows the broad concept of dividing a storage means into areas corresponding to divided display areas and further because storage, deletion or display of any kind of image data is a matter of a design choice which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In claims 7-8, relative to the limitations "schedule management function utilizing a calendar for reminding a user of a specific event on a particular date", such is also shown to be old by the calendar and scheduling feature of Bridson(column 22, lines 7-28).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridson and Omori as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of McGill et al(Us 20020016734A1).

Bridson and Omori are discussed above. McGill et al is cited to show that concept of utilizing a calendar and schedule function having a repetition cycle feature in an integrated household management system is old(paragraphs 42-55). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teaching of McGill et al to the modified system of Bridson such that to provide a repetition cycle feature so that a designated event would happen on a daily, weekly, monthly or yearly basis because Bridson also use a calendar and schedule function in his system and further because the repetition cycle reminder is a standard feature in any calendar and scheduling management devices. As to the limitation "determining whether a date on a schedule depends on a solar calendar or a lunar calendar", such is a matter of design choice because a lunar calendar or a solar calendar is still a calendar and it is a matter of software designation to specify the type of the calendar which is a simple design choice which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ross et al, key et al, Toda, Wharton et al and Kosuka are made

Art Unit: 2674

of record to show various types of devices either having memory blocks for storing image data corresponding to respective display areas or a data management device for an appliance.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mike Fatahiyar** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-6911**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

MF

M. Fatahiyar

November 26, 2003



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600